



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/517,364	03/02/2000	B. Scott Fabre	KDO:190230-0001	5185
26790	7590	10/22/2003	EXAMINER	
LAW OFFICE OF KAREN DANA OSTER, LLC PMB 1020 15450 SW BOONES FERRY ROAD #9 LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97035			NARAYANASWAMY, SINDYA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2174	8	
DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/517,364	FABRE, B. SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sindya Narayanaswamy	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) being unpatentable over Miyazaki.
3. As per claim 1, Miyazaki teaches the step for reducing first copy out times of printed matter, said method comprising the steps of: executing a request to print at least a portion of said printed matter (Fig. 4, Start; col. 4, lines 1-16), generating a uniqueness identifier in a host computer, the uniqueness identifier specifically associated with said at least a portion of said printed matter (col. 4, lines 23-27); comparing said uniqueness identifier to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory (col. 4, lines 18-23); printing said at least a portion of said printed matter using data stored in a memory location-referenced by said list of uniqueness identifiers if said uniqueness identifier is found in said list of uniqueness identifiers

(col. 4, lines 59-65); and storing said uniqueness identifier (register character pattern) and a reference to data stored in memory pertaining to said at least a portion of said printed matter in said list of uniqueness identifiers if said uniqueness identifier is not found in said list of uniqueness identifiers (col. 4, lines 28-29; Fig. 4, S5).

4. As per claim 2, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.
5. As per claim 3, Miyazaki teaches that the step of printing a “print portion” printing an entire print job (col. 2, lines 54-57).
6. As per claim 9, Miyazaki teaches the method wherein the step of comparing the uniqueness identifier to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory further comprising the step of comparing the uniqueness identifier to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory in a printer (Fig. 4, S5, col. 4, lines 28-29).
7. As per claim 10, Miyazaki teaches the method further comprising the step of transferring the uniqueness identifier from the host computer to the printer (Fig. 4, S12-S13; col. 4, lines 50-54).
8. As per claim 11, Miyazaki teaches the method comprising the step of transferring all or part of said at least a portion of the printed matter from the host computer to the printer if the uniqueness identifier is not found in the list of uniqueness identifiers (Fig. 4, S12-S13; col. 4, lines 50-54).

9. As per claim 12, Miyazaki teaches the method wherein the step of comparing the “print portion” uniqueness identifier to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory further comprising the step of comparing the uniqueness identifier to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory in a printer (Fig. 4, S5, col. 4, lines 28-29).
10. As per claim 13, Miyazaki teaches the method further comprising the step of transferring the “print portion” uniqueness identifier from the host computer to the printer (Fig. 4, S12-S13; col. 4, lines 50-54).
11. As per claim 14, Miyazaki teaches the method comprising the step of transferring all or part of the “print portion” of the printed matter from the host computer to the printer if the uniqueness identifier is not found in the list of uniqueness identifiers (Fig. 4, S12-S13; col. 4, lines 50-54).
12. As per claims 15, 16, 17, they are similar in scope to claims 12, 13, and 14 and are thus rejected on the same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 4-7 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a).
2. As per claim 4, Miyazaki does not explicitly teach the step of printing a portion of an entire print job as the "print portion." However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to complete a full print job in portions. One skilled in the art would be motivated to do so because it reduces the amount of time of printer processing that must be done.
3. As per claim 5, Miyazaki substantially teaches the method as claimed comprising the steps of:
 - (a) said step of generating a "print portion" uniqueness identifier specifically associated with said "print portion" including the step of generating a "print portion" uniqueness identifier 1-N in a host computer, the "print portion" uniqueness identifier 1-N specifically associated with each "print portion" 1-N of said entire print job (col. 4, lines 23-27);
 - (b) comparing said "print portion" uniqueness identifier 1-N to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory (col. 4, lines 18-23);
 - (c) printing said "print portion" 1-N using previously rendered data stored in a memory location referenced by said list of uniqueness identifiers if said "print portion" uniqueness identifier 1-N is found in said list of uniqueness identifiers (col. 4, lines 59-65); and

Art Unit: 2174

(d) storing said "print portion" uniqueness identifier 1-N and a reference to data stored in memory pertaining to said "print portion" 1-N in said list of uniqueness identifiers if said "print portion" uniqueness identifier 1-N is not found in said list of uniqueness identifiers (col. 4, lines 28-29; Fig. 4, S5);

(f) repeating steps (b)-(d) until said entire print job has been printed.

4. Miyazaki does not teach the step of determining whether said entire print job has been printed. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method to include the step of determining whether the entire print job was completed because it improves quality. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it improves the integrity of the system.

5. As per claim 6, Miyazaki does not teach the method further comprising the step of performing an efficiency check. However, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to perform an efficiency check for purposes of insuring quality. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to do so because it determines whether a pre-determined portion of a document should be re-rendered or printed using cache data, since in certain instances it may be more efficient to re-render data rather than use cached data.

6. As per claim 7, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

7. As per claim 8, it is rejected on the same basis as claims 6 and 7.

8. As per claim 18, Miyazaki teaches the method wherein the step of comparing the “print portion” uniqueness identifier 1-N to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory further comprising the step of comparing the “print portion” uniqueness identifier 1-N to a list of uniqueness identifiers stored in memory in a printer. (Fig. 4, S5, col. 4, lines 28-29).

9. As per claim 19, Miyazaki teaches the method further comprising the step of transferring the “print portion” uniqueness identifier 1-N from the host computer to the printer (Fig. 4, S12-S13; col. 4, lines 50-54).

10. As per claim 20, Miyazaki teaches the method comprising the step of transferring all or part of the “print portion” 1-N from the host computer to the printer if the “print portion” uniqueness identifier 1-N is not found in the list of uniqueness identifiers (Fig. 4, S12-S13; col. 4, lines 50-54).

Response To Argument

1. In the remarks, applicant has argued in substance that:

- (1) The “character pattern” as described by Miyazaki is not a uniqueness identifier.
- (2) The Miyazaki device is incapable of taking advantage of the ability not to transfer data that is already stored.
- (3) It is not obvious to complete a full print job in portions.

2. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments and resubmits that

As to point (1), in col. 4, lines 44-56 and Fig. 4, Miyazaki specifically describes that character data is transferred only after a search is completed and the data is not found in storage – thus, only “unique” data and codes are transferred.

As to point (2), in col. 4, lines 44-56 or Miyazaki, a detailed explanation is given as to how only data that has not been previously stored is transferred.

As to point (3), Examiner holds that it would have been obvious to execute a full print job in portions because in, the case of a large print job, portioning would prevent overload and jamming.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. “Interactive Printer Reward Scheme,” Silverbrook et al., US-6,457,883.
- b. “Method and Apparatus for Allocating Cache Memory Space For Font Data,” Cahoon, 5,592,594.

This action is a **final rejection** and is intended to close the prosecution of this application. Applicant's reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to this action is limited either to an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to an amendment complying with the requirements set forth below.

If applicant should desire to appeal any rejection made by the examiner, a Notice of Appeal must be filed within the period for reply identifying the rejected claim or claims appealed. The Notice of Appeal must be accompanied by the required appeal fee.

Art Unit: 2174

If applicant should desire to file an amendment, entry of a proposed amendment after final rejection cannot be made as a matter of right unless it merely cancels claims or complies with a formal requirement made earlier. Amendments touching the merits of the application which otherwise might not be proper may be admitted upon a showing a good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and why they were not presented earlier.

A reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection must include the appeal from, or cancellation of, each rejected claim. The filing of an amendment after final rejection, whether or not it is entered, does not stop the running of the statutory period for reply to the final rejection unless the examiner holds the claims to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, if a Notice of Appeal has not been filed properly within the period for reply, or any extension of this period obtained under either 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b), the application will become abandoned.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sindy Narayanaswamy whose telephone number is (703) 305-8473. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm, first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-5404 for regular communications and (703) 305-5404 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sindya Narayanaswamy
October 6, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100